

Remarks

1. Summary of Office Action

In the final Office Action mailed June 28, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and claims 19-23 and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,214,646 (Yacoby). Further, in the Advisory Action mailed on September 29, 2005 in response to Applicants' amendments and remarks filed on August 29, 2005, the Examiner maintained claim rejections over Yacoby.

2. Status of Claims

Applicants have cancelled claims 19-23 and 25-29. Further, Applicants have amended claim 24 to correct a minor typographical error. (See also Applicants' response filed on August 29, 2005 for this amendment).

Presently pending in this application are claims 17, 18, and 24, of which claims 17 and 24 are independent and claim 18 is dependent. In the final Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 17 and 18. Further, the Examiner indicated that claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

3. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 24-29 on grounds of indefiniteness. Applicants have cancelled claims 25-29, thus rendering these claim rejections moot.

Further, as noted above, Applicants have corrected a minor typographical error in independent claims 24 that gave rise to the antecedent basis rejection under 35 U.S.C. §

112. Applicants respectfully submit that this correction overcomes the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

4. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Further, the Examiner rejected claims 19-23 and 25-29 as being anticipated by Yacoby. Applicants have cancelled claims 19-23 and 25-29, thus rendering these claim rejections moot.

5. Comments on Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 17 and 18. Further, the Examiner indicated that claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As noted above, Applicants have amended claim 24 to overcome the § 112 rejection. Applicants believe that claim 24 is also in condition for allowance.

6. Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all of presently pending claims 17, 18, and 24 are in condition for allowance. Thus, favorable reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: October 28, 2005

By:

Joanna Skyles
Joanna Skyles
Reg. No. 54,454